Atty Docket No. 021756-017900US

PTO FAX NO.:   1-571-270-2072

ATTENTION: Examiner Alex N. Gofman   Group Art Unit 2162

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION

FOR THE PERSONAL ATTENTION OF

EXAMINER Alex N. Gofman

### CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following documents in re Application of Dmitry M. SMIRNOV et al., Application No. 10/661,167, filed September 12, 2003 for APPLICATION INTERFACE INCLUDING DYNAMIC TRANSFORM DEFINITIONS are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Documents Attached

1.   Examiner interview request form along with a continuation sheet.

Number of pages being transmitted, including this page, 3

Dated: 01/12/2011   _____
                                    Houtan Amahat

PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS PAPER BY
RETURN FACSIMILE AT (415) 576-0300

KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Telephone: 925-472-5000
Fax: 925-472-8895
4836

vi

Doc Code: M865 or FAI.REQ.INTV

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/661,167   First Named Applicant: Dmitry M. Smirnov
Examiner: GOFMAN, ALEX N   Art Unit: 2162   Status of Application: Non-Final Office Action Mailed

Tentative Participants:
(1) Mark Mathison   (2) Houtan Amanat

(3)_____   (4)_____

Proposed Date of Interview: 01/12/11   Proposed Time: 2 PM EST (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:
(1) [✓] Telephonic   (2) [ ] Personal   (3) [ ] Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [ ] YES   [✓] NO
If yes, provide brief description:_____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) 103	32	Lee	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(2) 103	32	Micco et al.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(3)			[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(4)			[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

[✓] Continuation Sheet Attached   [ ] Proposed Amendment or Arguments Attached
Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: The Claimed invention will be discussed. Differences between the
mentioned reference and the claimed invention will be discussed. (Please see the continuation sheet)
An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____

NOTE: This form should be completed and filed by applicant in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).
If this form is signed by a registered practitioner not of record, the Office will accept this as an indication that he
or she is authorized to conduct an interview on behalf of the principal (37 CFR 1.32(a)(3)) pursuant to 37 CFR
1.34. This is not a power of attorney to any above named practitioner. See the Instruction Sheet for this form,
which is incorporated by reference. By signing this form, applicant or practitioner is certifying that he or she has
read the Instruction Sheet. After the interview is conducted, applicant is advised to file a statement of the
substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible. This application will not be delayed from issue
because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview.

/Houtan Amanat/
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature   Examiner/SPE Signature
Houtan Amanat
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative
61,506
Registration Number, if applicable

Continuation Sheet for interview request form for application no. 10/661,167 (021756-017900US)

- Micco fails to teach or suggest "calling a dynamic function defined in the transform definition file, the dynamic function located **elsewhere in the transform definition file** from the definition pointer position" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Micco merely discloses:
  - o deriving information about a (source language) function that would enable the appropriate target language call (made from a source file to be translated) and using the derived information to translate the source file. Therefore, Micco fails to teach or suggest "calling a dynamic function defined in the transform definition file, the dynamic function located elsewhere in the transform definition file from the definition pointer position" as recited in claim 1.

- Lee fails to teach or suggest "positioning a **definition pointer** to point at a first **compound transform definition** within a transform definition file;" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Lee merely discloses:
  - o templates indicating that a program retrieves personal information from entries in a company's directory. Lee is silent about any pointer pointing to any part of the template and is silent about any compound transformation definition being present in the template. Therefore, Lee fails to teach or suggest "positioning a definition pointer to point at a first compound transform definition within a transform definition file" as recited in claim 1.

- The Office Action alleges that Lee's templates are similar to transform definitions. Applicants respectfully disagree because Lee's templates do not transform the structure of data.